

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering the application.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 26-28, 54-56, and 82-135 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 54, and 82 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims.

Examiner Interview

Applicants request an interview with the Examiner assigned this application prior to issuance of any further Office Action, should one be considered necessary.

Claim Amendments

Claims 26, 54, and 82 are amended to clarify aspects of the invention and to incorporate limitations of claims 97, 114, and 131, respectively. Further, claims 97, 114, and 131 are amended for consistency with the amendments to the independent claims. No new matter is added by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph [0020] of the originally-filed specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 26-28, 54-56, and 82-135 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0268347 ("Knauerhase") in view of U.S. Patent

Publication No. 2004/0199919 (“Tovinkere”). To the extent this rejection applies to the pending claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference; ...” MPEP § 2143(A).

Turning to the claims, amended independent claim 26 recites, in part, “receiving a second set of parametric information pertaining to a second PPM, the second PPM having a second architecture, wherein the first architecture is different from the second architecture” and “determining, based on at least one selected from a group consisting of the operational information in the first abstraction and the operational information in the second abstraction, whether to dispatch an execution thread for execution to one selected from a group consisting of one of the logical processing entities of the first PPM and one of the logical processing entities of the second PPM.” In other words, amended independent claim 26 requires, in part, dispatching an execution thread to one of a number of processing modules based on corresponding abstractions of the processing modules, where each abstraction describes a distinct architecture of its processing module. *See, e.g.,* originally-filed specification, paragraph [0020].

In contrast, Knauerhase discloses managing multiple *virtual* machines executing on a single

physical machine. *See* Knaurhase, paragraphs [0005] and [0020]. In other words, Knaurhase only discloses management of multiple virtual machines executing on a single machine architecture. However, Knaurhase is completely silent with respect to dispatching execution threads to one of a number of machines, where each machine has a distinct architecture. In view of this, Knaurhase fails to disclose or render obvious dispatching an execution thread to one of a number of processing modules based on corresponding abstractions of the processing modules, where each abstraction describes a distinct architecture of its processing module, as required by amended independent claim 26.

Furthermore, Tovinkere fails to provide that which Knaurhase lacks. Tovinkere discloses a method for allocating threads to logical processors of a hyper-threading enabled microprocessor. *See, e.g.*, Tovinkere, paragraphs [0016] and [0031]. In particular, Tovinkere only discloses that the logical processors have a single chip architecture (*e.g.*, IA-32 Intel® Architecture). *See* Tovinkere, paragraph [0016]. Thus, Tovinkere cannot disclose that each logical processor has a distinct chip architecture. In view of this, Tovinkere fails to disclose or render obvious dispatching an execution thread to one of a number of processing modules based on corresponding abstractions of the processing modules, where each abstraction describes a distinct architecture of its processing module, as required by amended independent claim 26.

In view of the above, Knaurhase and Tovinkere, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious all the limitations of amended independent claim 26. Thus, amended independent claim 26 is patentable over Knaurhase and Tovinkere. Amended independent claims 54 and 82 includes substantially similar limitations as amended independent claim 26 and, thus, are patentable over Knaurhase and Tovinkere for at least the same reasons as

amended independent claim 26. Dependent claims 27-28, 55-56, and 83-135 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 26, 54, and 82 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number: 33227/457001).

Dated: June 12, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
3945 Freedom Circle, Suite 300
Santa Clara, California 95054
(408) 727-0600
(408) 727-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants

Attachment (Examiner Interview Request)